with the Emotions, the Will, and the Conscience,, as constituting what may be appropriately called the Motive Powers of the mind. Of these three, we are required to consider in a special manner, merely the two last, which are truly the moral powers of humanity.

These three, the Emotions, the Will, the Conscience, are all included in the popular word " heart," and in the still looser phrase " feeling/' Much confusion has arisen from not distinguishing between these different powers, and from designating them all by one name, not inexpressive, but still very indefinite. How unsatisfactory the old theological controversy,, as fco whether faith is an exercise of the head or heart, when the precise boundary line between the head and heart is not drawn, when what is embraced in the heart is not unfolded, nor the various affections denoted by the word feeling carefully distinguished ?* We have always felt that there was a great vagueness in the controversy stirred up by Jacobi, when, in order to save philosophy from the rigid intellectualism of Kant, he called in Feeling or Faith, but without giving an inductive exposition of its elements, and of the several laws of each. With a real difference of opinion, there is a vast amount of logomachy in the dispute of the present day, as to whether religion is a matter of the intellect or of the feelings. When physical investigators appeal to a 3aw, they are expected to be prepared to specify its nature; and it is time that a similar rule were laid down for mental inquiry, and for theology, so far as it makes use of the facts of our moral nature. We are persuaded that no one can reason clearly or satisfactorily about the heart or feeling, who does not recognise at least three distinct elements as contained in it, the conscience, the will proper, and the emotions. He who would class all these in one generic word, will find himself in metaphysical, ethical, and theological speculation, often

predicating of one of them, say the feelings, what is true only of another, say the will, or of all what is true only of one, say the conscience.

Thus when we affirm that desire is an affection of the heart, we must be careful to explain whether we mean the emotions or

*** Saving faith seems to be, the consent of the will to the assent of the understanding, and commonly (not always,) because of the nature of the objects contemplated, accompanied by emotion. If this view be correct, it is the consent of the will, which constitutes the true difference between speculative and true faith.**